	Case 2:07-cv-00265-JCC Document 3	88 Filed 01/08/08 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
9 10	TIMOTHY E. SCOTT,	
11	Petitioner,	
12	v.	CASE NO. C07-0265-JCC
13	KENNETH QUINN,	ORDER
14	Respondent.	
15	This matter comes before the Court on Petitioner Timothy Scott's "Notice of Civil Appeal" (Dkt.	
16	No. 36), which the Court construes as a Motion for a Certificate of Appealability ("COA") of this	
17	Court's denial of Mr. Scott's motion to reopen his habeas corpus petition (Dkt. No. 31). Having	
18	reviewed Petitioner's motion and the record and determined that oral argument is not necessary, the	
19	Court hereby DENIES Petitioner's motion for a COA.	
20	I. LEGAL STANDARD	
21	The Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act requires that an unsuccessful habeas petitioner	
22	be granted a COA before he can appeal a district court's denial of habeas relief to the Court of Appeals.	
23	28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). Moreover, Petitioner must initially make an application for a COA in the district	
2425	court before the Court of Appeals may act on Petitioner's request. United States v. Mikels, 236 F.3d 550,	
26	ORDER – 1	

552 (9th Cir. 2001) (referencing requirements of both FED. R. APP. P. 22(b) and 9TH CIR. R. 22-1(a)). If 1 no express request for a COA is made, the district court is to construe a notice of appeal as a request for 2 3 a certificate. See Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 483 (2000); United States v. Asrar, 116 F.3d 1268, 1270 (9th Cir. 1997). The Court may issue a COA only if Petitioner "has made a substantial showing of 4 5 the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). II. **ANALYSIS** 6 7 Petitioner makes no argument as to why reasonable jurists would find the Court's decision debatable or wrong. In fact, Petitioner makes no argument at all; his Notice of Appeal is nothing more 8 9 than a notice that he is appealing. Because Petitioner fails to make any argument, the Court cannot find 10 that he has met his burden. 11 III. **CONCLUSION** 12 Petitioner has failed to make a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right. 13 Accordingly, the Court DENIES Petitioner's motion for a COA (Dkt. No. 36). 14 SO ORDERED this 8TH day of January, 2008. 15 16 17 18 United States District Judge

26 ORDER – 2

19

20

21

22

23

24

25